The Canadian Journal of Program Evaluation Vol. 19 No. 1 Pages 143–178
ISSN 0834-1516

RESEARCH AND PRACTICE NOTE

THE LAY OF THE LAND: EVALUATION PRACTICE IN CANADA TODAY

Benoît Gauthier
Réseau Circum inc.
Gatineau, Québec

Gail Barrington
Barrington Research Group Inc.
Calgary, Alberta

Sandra L. Bozzo
Ontario Ministry of Community Family and Children's Services
Toronto, Ontario

Kaireen Chaytor
Chaytor Consulting Services Ltd.
Halifax, Nova Scotia

Jim Cullen
Ministère de l'Éducation du Québec
Montréal, Québec

Robert Lahey
Treasury Board of Canada Secretariat
Ottawa, Ontario

Robert Malatest
R.A. Malatest and Associates Ltd.
Victoria, British Columbia

Grag Mason
Prairie Research Associates Ltd.
Winnipeg, Manitoba

John Mayne
Office of the Auditor General of Canada
Ottawa, Ontario

Anita Myers
University of Waterloo
Waterloo, Ontario

Nancy L. Porteous
Health Canada
Ottawa, Ontario

Simon Roy
GGI inc.
Ottawa, Ontario

Corresponding author: Benoît Gauthier, Réseau Circum inc.,
74, rue du Val-Perché, Gatineau, PQ J8Z 2A6; <gauthier@circum.com>

ne manque pas d'opportunités; on y retrouve la gestion basée sur les résultats, les efforts en partenariat et en défense des intérêts, la formation professionnelle individuelle et le rapprochement de la gestion des programmes et du développement des politiques. Mais d'abord, les évaluateurs doivent s'auto-définir pour mieux communiquer ce que pourrait être leur contribution particulière. L'article énonce quelques implications pour la pratique de l'évaluation au Canada et présente l'ébauche d'un plan de travail pour les évaluateurs individuellement et collectivement, dans leurs organisations et dans le cadre de leur association professionnelle. Un résumé en français ainsi que la version française des conclusions et implications sont présentés en annexe.

In 2001, the *Canadian Journal of Program Evaluation* devoted a special issue to provincial evaluation policy and practice in Canada. Accounts of provincial evaluation activity were provided for British Columbia (McDavid, 2001), Alberta (Bradley, 2001), Manitoba (Warrack, 2001), Ontario (Segsworth, 2001), Quebec (Cabatoff, 2001), Prince Edward Island (Mowry, Clough, MacDonald, Pranger, & Griner, 2001), Newfoundland (Ross, 2001) and the Northwest Territories (Hicks, 2001). In conclusion, Seasons (2001) identified some "areas of concern" flowing from the provincial profiles, including the following: considerable variation in uses and perceptions of evaluation, the lack of depth of evaluations and the emergence of performance measurement, the difficulty of bringing managers to think in terms of outcomes rather than outputs and in terms of performance rather than planning, and resource constraints. Being the first ever account of evaluation activity at the provincial level, this collection of articles represented a very important contribution to the knowledge of evaluation practice in Canada.

By design, these articles focused on governmental program evaluation policies and their implementation; they were not meant to take the pulse of evaluation practice or to provide a view of the health of program evaluation itself. This article sets out to fill that gap in knowledge by providing accounts of the strategic position of evaluation in a variety of Canadian contexts. This article translates today's challenges into ingredients for a plan for practice and action in program evaluation as a field of study.

In preparation for the 2003 Canadian Evaluation Society Conference, a group of evaluation practitioners and observers set out to take stock of the state of program evaluation in Canada. We accepted that each

A strength: the development of evaluation methodologies. During the past several years, provincial and federal agencies have recognized the various requirements associated with good program evaluation. Whereas, traditionally, many departments and agencies would conduct a client satisfaction survey as the primary program evaluation activity, there has been an increasing knowledge of the need to adopt quasi-experimental methods to support more rigorous program evaluation activities. Program evaluation methodologies have become more comprehensive and include a range of evaluation tools to demonstrate program success.

A weakness: the inadequate planning of program evaluations. Notwithstanding the enhanced awareness and use of various program evaluation tools, program evaluation occurs too often as an afterthought in the design and development of programs, rather than as an integral element of program design. The limited ability to incorporate adequate evaluation activities into program design could well reflect the pressures for staff to design and implement new programs quickly without establishing processes that could facilitate a rigorous assessment of program impact. In many cases, program design and implementation could be characterized as follows: design the program first and evaluate it later.

A threat: reduced program evaluation capacity in British Columbia. Significant reductions in provincial government employment in British Columbia will have negative ramifications for the ability of managers to champion program evaluation activities within ministries. As many reductions have occurred in the corporate support functions (i.e., policy development, strategic planning, and program evaluation), the ability of ministries to design and manage complex evaluations has been compromised. Of particular concern is the loss of resources at a time when government has placed greater emphasis on managing for outcomes and adopting an approach of continuous program improvement.

An opportunity: managing for outcomes. Program evaluation activities in both British Columbia and Alberta have been strengthened by strong government-wide commitment to measure and report on the key outcomes for almost all ministries and/or departments. The strong emphasis on performance measurement has provided impetus for managers to review or evaluate programs that may not be meeting targets. Continuous performance measurement activities have also generated significant volumes of data (i.e., ongoing sur-to departmental activities than to programs and services. In the not-for-profit sector, they may relate more closely to organizations' self-interest (i.e., funders' demands for demonstrated success and agencies' need to prove their value) than to clients' need for good programming. Ethical and methodological issues that warrant serious discussion are raised by this short-term view.

A threat: devaluation of evaluation. The focus on outcomes as an end in themselves and the avoidance of serious evaluation research into the meaning and context of program outcomes may have a significant backlash. When government and agencies eventually discover that although they are accountable, their services have not improved, evaluation may be devalued. Data gathering will be seen as a waste of time because it does not result in positive change. Even now, evaluation findings rarely end up on the decision makers' table, so any threat to the positive climate we are currently enjoying would be a serious setback.

An opportunity: linking accountability and evaluation. Despite these clouds on the horizon, the evaluators see the current environment as a real opportunity to forge the link between accountability and evaluation. The federal government's Results-based Management and Accountability Framework (RMAF) is seen as one such approach that could be applied at other levels of government as well. Alberta evaluators believe that they can make evaluation both more rigorous and more useful to decision makers, that they can talk the same language as the decision makers (i.e., outcomes) and yet shift the focus to best practice and program improvement. In fact, they feel that government and funders at all levels are primed to listen to them. There has never been a better time than the present to seize this opportunity!

The Devaluation of Evaluation
Greg Mason, Consultant, Winnipeg, Manitoba

A threat: short-term/short-view performance monitoring. Recent trends in evaluation, especially at the federal level, should concern Canadian evaluators. The increasing focus on performance measurement and auditing should be a welcome change for evaluators, but, in fact, as accountability and compliance become the order of the day, evaluators seem to be increasingly relegated to the background in managing programs. Nowhere is this clearer than in the ubiquitous RMAF (results-based management framework) and the object of performance measurement and audit, emerged as result of the grants and contributions (Gs&Cs) "scandal" in Human Resources Development Canada. At the time, most members of the opposition, the press, and the Canadian government concluded that the government was spending without control and welcomed processes that promised to limit the excess. Managing the risks associated with public spending gave rise to a series of new "risk" assessment and performance audit specialists who have created a wide array of policies related to disbursing money. The centrepiece of this new control, the Treasury Board's policy on transfer payments, details how government may award funding to third parties. Initially, Treasury Board required an RMAF and RBAF only for Gs&Cs, but now departments are applying the general framework to other policies and programs, even to the entire department.

Three factors figure in this devaluation of evaluation. First, despite the increased emphasis on measuring outcomes, few programs at the federal level actually do a very good job of this. In large measure, this is because, aside from a few areas such as defence, the federal government does not deal directly with end users. This is why it often resorts to Gs&Cs to effect change. However, providing funding to a third party to deliver programming is not really policy, but an abdication of policy, reflecting a lack of jurisdiction and imagination.

Second, evaluation units typically do not have independent budgets and often must get program managers to fund the evaluation. The budgets available for evaluation have remained fixed, and the entire function is underfunded. Given the resources expended on RMAFs/RBAFs and audits, this is not surprising, but the result is that the core evaluation questions remain unanswered.

A weakness: passivity in the face of threats. Third, evaluators have been passive in the face of threats to the function. Further, we have shown very little inventiveness in developing new approaches to testing the incremental impact of a program. Methodologies such as randomized trials and statistical techniques such as instrumental variables should be more common. When it comes to measuring the impact and cost-effectiveness of a program, focus groups and key informant interviews simply do not make the grade.

An opportunity: bridging program management and policy development. The evaluation function desperately needs rehabilitation. End-and reports receive little consideration (relative to scholarly publications) for tenure, promotion, and merit reviews.

An opportunity: using the mentoring model. Fortunately, academia is a learning and mentoring environment that allows faculty to pursue projects of personal interest, encourages conceptual and methodological debates, and promotes a mentorship/apprenticeship model for student training. The CES student case competition is a tremendous vehicle for furthering the training of future evaluators, generating interest among other students, and increasing the profile and legitimacy of evaluation throughout the university. For instance, at my Faculty our dean has proudly displayed the "crystal trophy," and members of finalist and winning teams have had their accomplishments recognized in the campus newspaper and at annual award receptions.

Thus, on balance, the strengths of program evaluation far outweigh the weaknesses, and we will continue to address the challenges and capitalize on the numerous opportunities our field has to offer.

Getting it Started, Making it Happen
Sandra L. Bozzo, Provincial Public Servant,
Toronto, Ontario

My commentary presents a perspective on the state of evaluation practice in Ontario that is based on my evaluation experiences in provincial government and non-profit/voluntary sector settings and on conversations with evaluators providing consulting services in Ontario.

A strength: the commitment. There has been a growing political commitment in Ontario to steer government in the direction of evaluation. This has stemmed from the ongoing recognition that all balanced policy decisions can and should be based on results, with evaluation serving as a tool for getting there. This commitment has willingly embraced the reality that voluntary/non-profit organizations have a role to play in government's own accountability and reporting. As well, government has recognized the need to subject itself to the same level of scrutiny that voluntary/non-profit organizations in receipt of public funds are subject to.

A weakness: the paradigm. The foundation of evaluation policies in Ontario has been, until very recently, focused on efficiency. Public funding interests, or programs and services delivered in partnership. Joint approaches to reporting and evaluation call for greater dialogue between public or private funders and voluntary/non-profit organizations and among different levels of government. This involves looking at funded programs and services through a different lens: as joint investments in communities and citizens with mutually beneficial outcomes.

A Global View
Nancy L. Porteous, Public Servant, Ottawa, Ontario

A strength: collaboration, participation, and balance. A real strength of the evaluation field today is that many evaluators are emphasizing collaboration, balancing the trade-offs between methodological rigour and meaningful participation in the evaluation process. A participatory approach involving stakeholders at key junctures in the evaluation helps in getting the rigour-to-relevance ratio right. Happily, I am encountering fewer of the old quantitative versus qualitative debates, as evaluation issues and questions are increasingly driving the evaluation design rather than the other way around. Both the art and science of evaluation are more and more appreciated. As a result, the core competencies for evaluators must include both well developed interpersonal and technical skills.

A threat: the effort required. Engaging others in the evaluation enterprise, though, takes time. Program stakeholders involved in the process often view evaluation as labour-intensive and time-consuming. Evaluation projects cannot be seen exclusively as externally mandated ventures to meet the information needs or reporting requirements of funders or senior managers. Evaluation must strive to meet the information and decision-making needs of a variety of stakeholders whenever and wherever possible. As evaluators, we must always be aware that how we interact with stakeholders in the evaluation of any given program, policy, or initiative largely shapes their view of evaluation. We must demystify evaluation and demonstrate its usefulness.

A weakness: promotion of evaluation. Demonstrating the value of evaluation, however, is a key weakness of the field today. There is currently no clear and convincing evidence that evaluation makes a difference. As a field, we are vulnerable at a time when other specialities are gaining ground and encroaching on evaluation's turf. There is, at best, a murky distinction between audit and evaluaalso a tool for their own management needs. A number have successfully implemented effective measurement mechanisms to assess their programs' performance before evaluation studies are actually conducted. Many managers also find that the tools used for monitoring frameworks, including the logic models, help them refine and better communicate their programs' rationale and objectives.

A weakness: neglecting key evaluation issues. While more focus on results monitoring may help departments meet accountability requirements, it has in many cases led to the neglect of other important evaluation issues. The strong performance measurement message sent to evaluators and managers has unfortunately encouraged some members of the community to focus most resources on this aspect of evaluation. As a result, other issues such as rationale, design, and delivery, even cost-effectiveness can be totally ignored in both summative and formative evaluations. I have witnessed a case in which extensive resources were invested in an evaluation solely to assess the impact of a program using a complex quasi-experimental design. Unfortunately, no significant impact was observed. In the absence of methodologies addressing design and delivery issues, however, there were no other sources of evidence indicating explanations or solutions to the problem(s). Even relevance issues were neglected, which prevented the evaluators from truly discussing the option of abandoning the program. In my view, measuring impacts does not even make sense in some programs where impacts are either obvious or very difficult to actually measure. On the other hand, effective methodologies, such as the use of an expert panel, can be used to truly review the relevance of these programs.

A threat: biasing the evaluation process. As mentioned above, the focus on performance measurement often leads to the active involvement of program staff in the monitoring processes. While it may lead to better ongoing performance measurement, it may also increase the risk of introducing biases in the evaluation process. The ongoing performance measurement processes are typically very objective measures (program outputs in most cases) that are not subject to extensive data analyses or interpretation. Managers can therefore supervise and manage the monitoring process without introducing too many biases, especially if the monitoring framework describes the process in detail upfront. However, personal experience shows that some program managers can also get directly involved in the evaluation of the programs for which they are responsible. In some cases, program managers will directly hire consuccess in "speaking truth to power" — it is too often a friendly (and ultimately less useful) function rather than a challenge function. Yet objectivity and independence were original defining characteristics of evaluation.

A threat: losing disciplinary independence. There is a real danger that, in trying to be too helpful for managers, evaluation becomes de facto a management consulting function, losing its competitive advantage and its independence. At the same time, there is the real danger of evaluation being subsumed by the accounting/auditing profession and their much stronger professional associations, with evaluators becoming the occasional experts brought in as needed. Those professions are much more aggressive in building a visible interest and expertise in such areas as performance measurement and working toward measurement and reporting standards. The scenario is then of evaluators managed by management consultants or accountants/auditors with certification forced on the evaluation profession by others.

An opportunity: bringing about results-based public service. Given the strong focus on results information in public sector management reform, evaluators have the theories, tools, knowledge, and skills needed to bring about a results-based public service. They are best placed, by a considerable degree, to play a leading role if a more activist agenda is pursued seeking to align evaluation more closely with the results-based agenda of governments. Sensible results measurement skills are badly needed in the public sector, but are often being pursued by others without the necessary evaluation skills and knowledge.

Issues of Both Supply and Demand
Robert Lahey, Public Servant, Ottawa, Ontario

This synopsis is taken from the perspective of the practice of evaluation in federal departments and agencies subject to the Treasury Board Evaluation Policy (some 87 federal organizations).

The evaluation function has been going through a period of revitalization over the last couple of years, with the infusion of new funds from the Treasury Board Secretariat, the creation of a Centre of Excellence for Evaluation, and a strong desire from the Centre to rebuild capacity and reposition the function in line with the federal government's vision of modern management and *Results for Canadians* (no date). The function is therefore very much in a period of transition.

The demographics of this functional community are only going to worsen this situation. Growing the type of evaluators described above takes time but is fundamental to the development of evaluators in the public service and to the long-term sustainability of evaluation in the public service.

A threat: insufficient links with senior management. Evaluation groups are not always linked, or well linked, to the needs of senior executive committees in government. As a result, they may not be fully cognizant of the expectations and priorities of senior managers. Additionally, senior executives may not fully appreciate what evaluation and evaluators can deliver on. The function is not always well understood. Additionally, it has an uneven history across government of meeting expectations. As a result, evaluators and the function still face issues of credibility. The net result is that, in some organizations, evaluation may be deemed to be irrelevant and may not get ingrained into the culture of the organization's management practices. Over time, if viewed this way, it may serve as a target for spending cuts or reallocation of scarce resources.

An opportunity: need for performance information. The reallocation exercise announced in the 2003 federal budget is calling for timely, objective, and credible information on the performance of programs, as is the longer-term expenditure and management review exercise that the federal government has announced. This offers an opportunity to position the evaluation function as a decision-making tool for resource allocation as well as program improvement and accountability. The framework for expenditure and management reviews (EMRs) borrows heavily from evaluation. Many of the fundamental issues of the EMRs are parallel to the kind that evaluators focus on in summative evaluation. Furthermore, these reviews are intended to be a long-term and ongoing initiative that will be fundamental to the government's commitment to ensure Canadians know where and how their tax dollars are being used, and that they are spent wisely. The evaluation function in departments and agencies should be a part of this initiative. It will not happen by itself, though. It will require evaluators to position themselves with senior management in organizations and demonstrate in a proactive way how the practice of evaluation, and the skill set of evaluators, can assist senior managers in meeting what is likely their top priority for the foreseeable future.

cused evaluation training, or to some other factor, it is still a key weakness of the field today because of the threat it represents.

A threat: disappearing by lack of identity. The main threat to program evaluation today is that it is losing its individual identity as a scientific enquiry into program rationale and effectiveness. Program evaluation is more and more subsumed under parallel but essentially foreign sets of analytical approaches such as audit and review. For example, it is becoming increasingly difficult to distinguish certain forms of audits from process evaluation. Program evaluation has progressively lost its distinguishing character: it used to be a rigorous assessment of facts through the lens of social science aimed at improved decision-making. Today, it sometimes resembles a collection of opinions guided by the necessity to offer the semblance of performance information. The persistence of this vague positioning is likely to mean the disappearance of program evaluation as a field of study because, if program evaluation does not offer clear added value, other, well established domains of inquiry like auditing and accounting will take over the provision of performance information to program managers.

An opportunity: an appetite for performance information. There is a ray of hope for our trade. Since 1984 and even more so since 1994, public service managers have had to learn to work with limited program resources. One consequence of this change has been a renewed appetite for performance information. Program managers need intelligence to make the best of available resources, to redress ineffective programs, and to identify alternative approaches to addressing social problems. As evaluators, we know that we are in a particularly good position to offer this kind of strategic read. However, other professionals and other domains of inquiry also play on this field. In order to benefit from this opportunity, program evaluators need to demonstrate that they can provide better evidence through the credible, scientific demonstration of program rationale and effectiveness — and not only through superficial description.

A New Era
Jim Cullen, Public Servant, Montreal, Quebec

A strength: a professional development plan. The CES *Project in Support of Advocacy and Professional Development* (<http://consultation.evaluationcanada.ca/englishhome.htm>) is an excellent opportunity to better understand evaluation practice and improve teaching and learning on the topic of evaluation. Let me offer a few thoughts about building evaluation capacity through in-service teaching and learning. I use the term "teaching" to include course delivery which comprises principles of evaluation and respect for many disciplines and approaches to evaluations, as well as holding relevance for current public policy demands. Effective learning occurs only in the presence of three ingredients: an opportunity to apply knowledge and skills based on principles, a willingness to engage in team work, and a willingness to undertake evaluation as a learning endeavour.

An opportunity: demand for skills. The demand for knowledge and skills to carry out evaluation should be viewed as a key opportunity for evaluation as a field of study. The demand is coming partly from legislation or other requirements for accountability. However, the demand speaks to the recognition of the role of evaluation and the recognition that expertise is required. The demand must be seen as an opportunity to seize.

A weakness: lack of disciplinary focus. The diversity of educational preparation to practice evaluation, while healthy in some respects, can also be viewed as a weakness. Each discipline present at any table views evaluation a bit differently. Rather than focus on the principles of evaluation, it is common to focus on the differences in a method or an approach to analysis and thus believe the differences are greater than they are. The teaching and learning is expected to accommodate all differences through focusing on common ground.

A threat: disconnection from management needs. Partly because of the lack of common ground, evaluation as a part of management may be under threat. Programs get their direction for evaluation from various schools of management, without a sense of the role or theory of evaluation. Program theory and the relevant public policy should be assessed using a theory of evaluation. Tying evaluation to the demands of public policy gives it relevance beyond audit or a predefined cost-benefit analysis.

A strength: a capacity to self-define. The time for evaluation to better define and present itself as a field of study having value for public sector management is now. There is an opportunity to help with accountability and reporting demands if evaluation is carried out in such a way that it addresses public sector management needs. The ficient connection with management needs. Various events have propelled performance monitoring and short-term performance measurement to the front of the management scene; despite the intentions of the RMAF initiatives that aim to focus people on results, many managers are now content to possess a performance measurement framework that often focuses on the obvious outputs rather than providing a more in-depth assessment of program logic and performance to better understand why certain results are or are not observed. Positioning evaluation as an *ad hoc* exercise with little to no follow-up within organizations has prevented evaluators from building connections with program managers and demonstrating the value of their skills. Also, over the past 10 to 20 years, other fields of practice (e.g., auditing, accounting), with clearer identities, have encroached into what evaluators consider their program assessment territory while evaluators were less than proactive at building the professional capacity and the profile of the profession. Overall, there is a real threat to the very existence of program evaluation: lack of demonstrated value, weak self-definition as a domain of inquiry, program monitoring seen as a substitute approach by many, and lack of strategic positioning in organizations could translate into diminishing desire to fund program evaluation.

Opportunities. But there is hope. Clearly, results-based and outcome-based management are here to stay, at least for the next few years. We, evaluators, know that we can contribute significantly to making this trend a reality on the ground. We need to make that known, though, collectively through advocacy and partnership efforts and individually within our organizations by ensuring that we are ready for the challenge (getting the appropriate training, networking to learn about opportunities and difficulties, etc.). Evaluators have the opportunity to reconnect with program managers by listening to their needs and identifying how our skills can best be put to use in that context; in particular, no other field of enquiry is as poised as program evaluation is to establish the bridge between program management and policy development. But first, evaluators must clarify for themselves who they are; they must self-define so that they can communicate to others what their specific contribution is and what service they provide that no other professional offers. This self-definition will also help recruit new members to the evaluation trade as would various associative actions specifically oriented to attracting students.

This analysis has a number of important implications for the practice of evaluation in Canada today.

REFERENCES

Altschuld, J.W., & Engle, M. (1994). The preparation of professional evaluators: Issues, perspectives and programs. *New Directions for Program Evaluation*, 62. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Bradley, S.E. (2001). Evaluation in the Government of Alberta: Adapting to the "new way." *Canadian Journal of Program Evaluation, 16*(Special Issue), 29–44.

Cabatoff, K. (2001). The long march from evaluation to accreditation: Québec's new "government management framework." *Canadian Journal of Program Evaluation*, *16*(Special Issue), 73–88.

Hicks, K. (2001). Program evaluation in the Government of the Northwest Territories, 1967–2000. *Canadian Journal of Program Evaluation*, *16*(Special Issue), 107–114.

Kishchuk, N. (2003). La transparence: Ennemi du progrès en évaluation de programmes? Retrieved on February 10, 2004 from <http://www.sqep.ca/archives/presentations/Kishchuknatalie.pdf>.

McDavid, J.C. (2001). Program evaluation in British Columbia in a time of transition: 1995–2000. *Canadian Journal of Program Evaluation*, *16*(Special Issue), 3–28.

Mowry, S., Clough, K., MacDonald, B., Pranger, T., & Griner, D. (2001). Evaluation policy and practice in the provincial government of Prince Edward Island. *Canadian Journal of Program Evaluation*, *16*(Special Issue), 89–100.

Preskill, H. (2000). Coming around again: Renewing our commitment to teaching evaluation. *American Journal of Program Evaluation, 21*(1), 103–104.

Ross, A. (2001). Evaluation in Newfoundland: Then was then and now is now. *Canadian Journal of Program Evaluation*, *16*(Special Issue), 101–106.

Seasons, M. (2001). Epilogue, *Canadian Journal of Program Evaluation*, *16*(Special Issue), 115–118.

Segsworth, R. (2001). Evaluation policy and practice in Ontario. *Canadian Journal of Program Evaluation*, *16*(Special Issue), 59–72.

et qui ont à cœur de fournir une information pertinente. Avec le *Soutien pour la défense des intérêts et le développement professionnel* (Zorzi, McGuire, & Perrin, 2002) de la SCÉ, les évaluateurs ont en main un plan collectif de développement professionnel pour les aider à mieux se définir. Enfin, la pratique de l'évaluation insiste de nos jours sur l'engagement des gestionnaires de programme, la participation des intéressés et la collaboration de tous et chacun.

Les faiblesses. Malgré les compétences particulières de ses praticiens, l'évaluation de programme n'a pas encore acquis d'identité propre, et il a été difficile d'en démontrer la valeur, notamment en regard du suivi du rendement à court terme. De façon générale, l'évaluation de programme n'a pas pu absorber les exigences de la mesure du rendement qui se sont profilées au cours des cinq dernières années. Aux prises avec une pénurie de ressources, les gestionnaires ont fait, entre l'évaluation et la mesure du rendement, des choix qui auraient pu être évités si les évaluateurs de programme avaient su revêtir d'un intérêt stratégique leurs compétences et leurs connaissances. Dans leurs tentatives d'adaptation, les évaluateurs ont parfois renoncé à leur spécificité en négligeant des enjeux clés de l'évaluation et en donnant moins d'importance à la rigueur. La faiblesse de l'identité propre nuit à la production de spécialistes de l'évaluation de programme à l'université.

Les menaces. Le contexte dans lequel se pratique de nos jours l'évaluation de programme présente trois grandes menaces reliées entre elles: la faveur accordée au suivi des programmes, l'absence d'une identité propre à l'évaluation de programme et une prise en considération insuffisante des besoins des gestionnaires. Divers événements ont permis au suivi du rendement et à la mesure du rendement à court terme de se hisser à l'avant-plan dans le domaine de la gestion; bon nombre de gestionnaires se satisfont d'un cadre de la mesure du rendement qui ne mentionne souvent que les résultats les plus évidents au lieu de procéder à un examen plus approfondi de la logique d'un programme et de son rendement en vue de mieux saisir la raison d'être de la présence ou de l'absence de certains résultats. Le fait que l'évaluation soit perçue comme un exercice ponctuel sans nécessité de suivi, ou presque, au sein des organisations a empêché les évaluateurs de tisser des liens avec les gestionnaires de programme et de leur démontrer leur savoir-faire. En outre, au cours des 10 à 20 dernières années, d'autres champs à l'identité mieux définie (comme la vérification, la comptabilité, etc.) se sont immiscées dans le champ de l'examen de programme que les évaluateurs prentissage organisationnels. La SCÉ est déjà engagée dans cette voie (Zorzi, Perrin, et al., 2002).

- *Enseignement et recrutement:* L'université doit se tenir à l'affût des défis de la pratique et préparer les étudiants aux réalités de l'évaluation en tant que participante, avec bien d'autres champs d'étude, à la dynamique organisationnelle. L'université a aussi pour tâche de faire connaître aux étudiants l'existence de l'évaluation et d'en souligner les caractéristiques particulières.
- *Développement du savoir:* Les chercheurs (universitaires, surtout) doivent établir quelles sont les meilleures pratiques d'évaluation et exposer les adaptations à apporter à la profession dans l'intérêt de ses membres.
- *Perfectionnement professionnel:* Les évaluateurs de programme doivent se tenir au courant des nouvelles façons d'aborder l'évaluation — ce qui ne se borne pas à apprendre les techniques mais aussi à se renseigner sur la dynamique de l'organisation, sur la gestion ainsi que l'intégration de l'évaluation aux modèles de gestion.
- *Leadership à l'échelle locale et globale:* L'évaluateur doit faire preuve de leadership. Nous devons nous faire connaître au sein de nos organisations, notamment comme spécialistes de la mesure (de toute nature, y compris en examen et suivi du rendement) et de l'établissement des résultats des programmes et des politiques. Il nous faut nous positionner parmi les nombreux intervenants qui soutiennent les organisations. De manière plus globale, il faudra faire en sorte que notre champ d'étude soit moins centré sur lui-même, et exercer une véritable influence sur les membres des autres professions.
- *Maillage:* Les évaluateurs doivent apprendre les uns des autres. Nous devons nous communiquer nos meilleures méthodes et nos réussites ainsi que nous appuyer mutuellement dans la pratique. D'où la nécessité de former des réseaux d'évaluateurs à l'échelle locale (rendus possibles grâce aux sections de la SCÉ) de même que des collectivités virtuelles organisées en fonction des champs d'intérêts.
- *Valorisation personnelle:* Chaque évaluateur doit se persuader que la profession a quelque chose de spécial à offrir; les évaluateurs sont les spécialistes de la démonstration rigoureuse, empirique et défendable touchant les résultats et le rendement, mise au point en partenariat avec d'autres intervenants de la vie organisationnelle.

	processus évaluatif	aux paramètres de conception et à la prestation du service	mesure du rendement	visés
John Mayne, fonctionnaire, Ottawa	L'accent sur la pratique terre à terre plutôt que sur l'accroissement de la connaissance	L'intégration insuffisante avec les besoins des gestionnaires de programmes	La perte de l'indépendance disciplinaire alors que des professions mieux organisées envahissent le territoire de l'évaluation	Contribuer à faire du service public basé sur les résultats une réalité
Robert Lahey, fonctionnaire, Ottawa	La capacité analytique des évaluateurs	Le manque de ressources humaines qualifiées en évaluation	Des liens ténus avec la haute direction des organisations	L'appétit actuel pour l'information sur le rendement
Benoît Gauthier, consultant, Gatineau	La pertinence des travaux pour les gestionnaires visés	La diminution de l'attention portée à la rigueur méthodologique des recherches	La disparition causée par un manque d'identité professionnelle distinctive	La demande élevée pour l'information sur le rendement et la capacité des évaluateurs de produire un savoir scientifique crédible
Jim Cullen, fonctionnaire, Montréal	L'existence d'un plan de formation professionnelle	Le manque d'attention accordée à la mesure de l'attribution des effets des programmes	L'absence de référence explicite à l'évaluation dans la récente réforme de l'administration publique au Québec	L'importance de la pensée évaluative dans la nouvelle *Loi sur l'administration publique* du Québec
Kaireen Chaytor, consultante, Halifax	La capacité des évaluateurs de s'auto-définir en tant que champ de connaissance	Le manque d'homogénéité disciplinaire dans la formation des évaluateurs	Le manque de connaissance des besoins des gestionnaires de programmes	La demande importante pour les connaissances et les habiletés des évaluateurs

tion in the Canadian federal government — focused on rebuilding capacity and repositioning the function in line with results-based management. His 32-year career in the federal government, where he headed the evaluation unit in five federal organizations, is now being followed up by a broad set of interests in evaluation capacity building and professional development for the community at large.

Robert Malatest (BA, MA [Economics]) is the principal of R.A. Malatest & Associates Ltd., based in Victoria. He has managed more than 100 evaluations during the past 15 years, including several major national evaluations of education, technology, and housing programs. These evaluations have included both formative and summative studies as well as research projects examining the impacts of selected economic and social programs on various groups.

Greg Mason, managing partner of Prairie Research Associates (PRA) Inc., is a Certified Management Consultant and economist specializing in applied policy analysis, forecasting, consumer demand analysis, survey research, and program evaluation. His consulting assignments have spanned a broad range of projects including program and policy evaluations, market research, economic and econometric forecasts, regulatory analysis, and feasibility studies. Trained as a quantitative researcher, he has also conducted and managed an extensive range of qualitative research.

Dr. John Mayne is an independent consultant. Until recently, he was at the Office of the Auditor General where he led efforts at developing practices for effective performance measurement, managing for results, and performance reporting in the Government of Canada, developing methodologies for providing audit assurance on performance reports, and leading the Office's audit efforts in accountability and governance. He has authored numerous articles and reports, and edited five books in the areas of program evaluation, public administration, and performance monitoring. In 1989 and in 1995, he was awarded the CES Award for Contribution to Evaluation in Canada.

Dr. Anita Myers is a full professor in the Department of Health Studies & Gerontology at the University of Waterloo. In addition to extensive teaching experience, she has published numerous journal articles and a book on program evaluation. She serves on the CJPE editorial board, was on the CES national council from 1993 to 1997, and received the CES Contribution to Evaluation in Canada award in 1997.